



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/525,641

02/25/2005

Kazuo Kuroda

041465-5258

8459

55694 7590 11/10/2008
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC)
1500 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209

EXAMINER

QAYYUM, ZESHAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3685

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/525,641	Applicant(s) KURODA, KAZUO	
	Examiner ZESHAN QAYYUM	Art Unit 3685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9, 11-14, 16-20, 22-25 and 27-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 15, 21 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/25/2005, 07/18/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of claims

1. Claims 1-8, 15, 21 and 26 have been examined.
2. Claims 9, 11-14, 16-20, 22-25 and 27-32 have been withdrawn by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-8 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. The term "normal" in claim 1 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "normal" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.
5. Claims 2-8 are also rejected as each depends from claim 1.
6. Claim 26 state that an information recording medium. Claim 26 is depend from claim 21 that states the information generating program. It is unclear to one of the ordinary person that applicant claiming a program or the medium? (*In re Zletz*, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 3685

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
8. Claim 15 is directed to a method. As the claims are not sufficiently tied to an apparatus, such as a computer, and/or do not transform the underlying subject matter to a different state the claimed method is non-statutory and therefore rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)).
9. Claim 21 is directed to an information generating program. However, this is merely software, and it has been held that software without a required computer-readable medium-storing software that, when executed, causes the computer to perform a particular process or method (MPEP 2106.01) is merely nonfunctional descriptive material and non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3685

10. Claims 1-8, 15, 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muratani (US 6804375).
11. With respect to claims 1, 8, 15 and 21, Muratani discloses: embedding the watermark with in digital content (i.e. signal). Watermark includes information like rights information, copy control information; use condition information (See column 1, lines 32-40). Muratani does not explicitly disclose change copy control information and normal copy control information. However, adding any kind of information such as change control information and normal control information to the watermark is a predictable result to having watermark that includes information like rights information, copy control information, use condition information, etc. (*KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007)).

In addition functional recitation(s) using the word “for” has been considered but is given little patentable weight because they fail to add any structural limitations and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed product must result in a structural difference between the claimed product and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed product from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it reads on the claimed limitation. *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) (“The manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself.”);

Art Unit: 3685

In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See also MPEP §§ 2114 and 2115.

12. With respect to claims 2-6, each is describing the changing operation. The changing operation is not the part of apparatus. It is the part of intended use of the apparatus. Therefore, it has been held While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function alone -MPEP 2114; *In re Swineheart*, 169 USPQ 226; *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997).
13. With respect to claims 3 and 7 each is directed to stored data. However, as the stored data does not functionally related to the memory in which it is stored it does not distinguish the claimed apparatus, method, and system from the prior art (*In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), *In re Lowry*, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP 2106.01)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3685

- Van Wie (US 5943422) discloses Steganographic Techniques for securely delivering electronic digital rights management control information over insecure communication channels.
- Kambayashi (US 7127431) discloses Information recording device and information reproducing device.
- Matsumura (US 7336799) discloses Digital Watermark Embedding device and digital watermark embedding method.
- Levy (US 7142691) discloses Watermark Embedding functions in rendering description files.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZESHAN QAYYUM whose telephone number is (571)270-3323. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin L. Hewitt can be reached on (571)272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3685

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Z. Q./

Examiner, Art Unit 3685

/Calvin L Hewitt II/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685